REMARKS

The present application was filed on September 26, 2003 with claims 1 through 25. Claims 1 through 25 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staples et al. (United States Patent Number 5,889,845).

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors.

Independent Claims 1, 13, 18 and 23

Independent claims 1, 13, 18, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staples et al. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Staples discloses translating the presence information from at least one of the presence data stores into a standard format (abstract; FIGS. 1, 10, and 12-20; col. 2, line 40, to col. 3, line 67). Regarding claim 13, the Examiner asserts that Staples discloses determining the presence status of the user based on one or more rules that are applied to the obtained presence information.

Applicants note that the present invention teaches that,

> generally, the presence proxy 200 converts or translates presence information extracted or obtained from the presence data stores 210 to a standard format. For example, *if the presence data store 210-1 is a Lotus Notes Server, the presence data collector 220-1 can act as a Lotus Notes client to obtain the desired presence information.* Likewise, *if the presence data store 210-1 is a Microsoft Exchange Server, an application program interface (API), such as an API from the Microsoft Collaboration Data Objects library (CDO) can be employed to obtain the desired presence information. If the presence data store 210-1 is a Calendar Server that exposes an Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) standards-based iCalendar interface, such as a Netscape Directory Server, the presence information can be extracted using the iCalendar interface.* Generally, the presence data collectors 220 take care of the interaction between the presence proxy 200 and the various presence data stores 210. *The extracted presence information is then translated to a* ***standard format****, if necessary. For example, the presence data collector 220 can convert extracted presence information to an XML document following the CPIM model.*
> (Page 6, lines 3-16; emphasis added.)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Applicants could find no disclosure or suggestion by Staples of translating presence information from at least one of the presence data stores into a *standard format*. Independent claims 1 and 18 require translating the presence information from at least one of the presence data stores into a *standard format*.

Applicants also note that the present invention teaches that,

> as shown in FIG. 2, the presence proxy 200 provides a programmable interface 230 to enable rule-based filtering and aggregation of the presence information. In this manner, the present invention supports the user-specification of logic that determines whether the user is actually "present." Thus, *a user can define **filtering rules** that determine how the presence information of the user is shared with applications*. In addition, a user can specify aggregation rules that determine when a user is present based on the information obtained from the various presence data stores 210. For example, a user can specify an aggregation rule stating that "whenever there is a conflict between an appointment in my Microsoft™ Outlook Calendar and my Palm™ Calendar, my presence shall always be determined based on the appointment specified in my Palm Calendar." In addition, the text analysis engine 240 can be trained to recognize certain keywords that determine the presence of the user. The text analysis engine 240 can analyze scheduled appointments/meetings for keywords and infer the presence information for the user according to the user's rules. For example, a user could create a rule that establishes his or her status as "busy" whenever the user has the "lunch" keyword in his appointments. Likewise, the user could create a rule that establishes his or her status as "unavailable" whenever the "tele-conf" keyword appears in the user's appointments.
> (Page 7, line 26, to page 8, line 11.)

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Applicants could find no disclosure or suggestion by Staples of determining presence status of a user based on *one or more rules* that are applied to the obtained presence information. Independent claims 13 and 23 require determining said presence status of said user based on ***one or more rules*** that are applied to said obtained presence information.

Thus, Staples et al. do not disclose or suggest translating the presence information from at least one of the presence data stores into a standard format, as required by independent claims 1 and 18, and do not disclose or suggest determining said presence status of said user based on one or more rules that are applied to said obtained presence information, as required by independent claims 13 and 23.

Dependent Claims 2-12, 14-17, 19-22 and 24-25

Dependent claims 2-12, 14-17, 19-22 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Staples et al.

Claims 2-12, 14-17, 19-22 and 24-25 are dependent on claims 1, 13, 18, and 23, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Staples et al. because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 13, 18, and 23 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 27, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560